

Document made available under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT)

International application number: PCT/IL05/000063

International filing date: 19 January 2005 (19.01.2005)

Document type: Certified copy of priority document

Document details: Country/Office: US
Number: 60/560,049
Filing date: 08 April 2004 (08.04.2004)

Date of receipt at the International Bureau: 31 March 2005 (31.03.2005)


Remark: Priority document submitted or transmitted to the International Bureau in compliance with Rule 17.1(a) or (b)



World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) - Geneva, Switzerland
Organisation Mondiale de la Propriété Intellectuelle (OMPI) - Genève, Suisse

23 MAR 2005

PA 1291622



THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TO ALL TO WHOM THESE PRESENTS SHALL COME:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

March 08, 2005

**THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT ANNEXED HERETO IS A TRUE COPY FROM
THE RECORDS OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE OF THOSE PAPERS OF THE BELOW IDENTIFIED PATENT
APPLICATION THAT MET THE REQUIREMENTS TO BE GRANTED A
FILING DATE UNDER 35 USC 111.**

APPLICATION NUMBER: 60/560,049

FILING DATE: April 08, 2004

**By Authority of the
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS**



L. Edele

L. EDELEN
Certifying Officer

PTO/SB/16 (01-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0032

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PROVISIONAL APPLICATION FOR PATENT COVER SHEET

This is a request for filing a PROVISIONAL APPLICATION FOR PATENT under 37 CFR 1.53(c).

Express Mail Label No. _____

22151 U.S. PTO
601560049040804
040804**INVENTOR(S)**

Given Name (first and middle [if any])	Family Name or Surname	Residence (City and either State or Foreign Country)
EREZ	DACAN	JERUSALEM, ISRAEL

Additional inventors are being named on the 1 separately numbered sheets attached hereto**TITLE OF THE INVENTION (500 characters max)**

FORWARD COLLISION WARNING WITH A SINGLE CAMERA

Direct all correspondence to: CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS

 Customer Number: _____

OR

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Firm or Individual Name	MOBILEME TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED		
Address	TULIA HOUSE		
Address	3 THEMISTOKLIS DERRIS STREET		
City	NICOSIA	State	Zip
Country	CYPRUS	Telephone +357 22 671 808	Fax +357 22 675 446

ENCLOSED APPLICATION PARTS (check all that apply)

- Specification Number of Pages 11
 Drawing(s) Number of Sheets _____
 Application Data Sheet. See 37 CFR 1.76

CD(s), Number _____
 Other (specify) _____

METHOD OF PAYMENT OF FILING FEES FOR THIS PROVISIONAL APPLICATION FOR PATENT

- Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27.
 A check or money order is enclosed to cover the filing fees.
 The Director is hereby authorized to charge filing fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number: _____
 Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

FILING FEE
Amount (\$)

\$ 80

The invention was made by an agency of the United States Government or under a contract with an agency of the United States Government.

- No.
 Yes, the name of the U.S. Government agency and the Government contract number are: _____

[Page 1 of 2] Date 03/22/04 FILED APR 22 2004
 RECEIVED
 REGISTRATION NO. _____
 (if appropriate)
 Docket Number: SP-102

Respectfully submitted,

SIGNATURE Gideon P. Stein
TYPED or PRINTED NAME GIDEON P. STEINTELEPHONE +972-2-541-7333**USE ONLY FOR FILING A PROVISIONAL APPLICATION FOR PATENT**

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.51. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 8 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop Provisional Application, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

PROVISIONAL APPLICATION COVER SHEET
Additional Page

PTO/SB/16 (08-03)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0551-0032

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Docket Number

INVENTOR(S)/APPLICANT(S)

Given Name (first and middle if any)	Family or Surname	Residence (City and either State or Foreign Country)
OFER	MANO	MODI'IN, ISRAEL
GIDEON. P.	STEIN	JERUSALEM, ISRAEL
AMNON	SHASHUA	JERUSALEM, ISRAEL

[Page 2 of 2]

Number 1 of 1

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2004

Effective 10/01/2003. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

 Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$)80

Complete if Known

Application Number	
Filing Date	<u>03/22/04</u>
First Named Inventor	<u>EREFZ DADAN</u>
Examiner Name	
Art Unit	
Attorney Docket No.	

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)

 Check Credit card Money Order Other None Deposit Account:

Deposit Account Number	
Deposit Account Name	

The Director is authorized to: (check all that apply)

- Charge fee(s) indicated below Credit any overpayments
 Charge any additional fee(s) or any underpayment of fee(s)
 Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee

to the above-identified deposit account.

FEE CALCULATION (continued)

3. ADDITIONAL FEES

Large Entity Small Entity

Fee Code (\$)	Fee (\$)	Fee Code (\$)	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1051	130	2051	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
1052	50	2052	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet	
1053	130	1053	130	Non-English specification	
1812	2,520	1812	2,520	For filing a request for ex parte reexamination	
1804	920*	1804	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
1805	1,840*	1805	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
1251	110	2251	55	Extension for reply within first month	
1252	420	2252	210	Extension for reply within second month	
1253	950	2253	475	Extension for reply within third month	
1254	1,480	2254	740	Extension for reply within fourth month	
1255	2,010	2255	1,005	Extension for reply within fifth month	
1401	330	2401	165	Notice of Appeal	
1402	330	2402	165	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	
1403	290	2403	145	Request for oral hearing	
1451	1,510	1451	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
1452	110	2452	55	Petition to revive - unavoidable	
1453	1,330	2453	665	Petition to revive - unintentional	
1501	1,330	2501	665	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
1502	480	2502	240	Design issue fee	
1503	640	2503	320	Plant issue fee	
1460	130	1460	130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
1807	50	1807	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)	
1806	180	1806	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
8021	40	8021	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
1809	770	2809	385	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(e))	
1810	770	2810	385	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))	
1801	770	2801	385	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
1802	900	1802	900	Request for expedited examination of a design application	

SUBTOTAL (1) (\$)80

2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE

Total Claims	-20** =	X	=	Fee from below	Fee Paid
Independent Claims	-3** =	X	=		
Multiple Dependent					

Large Entity	Small Entity	Fee Description
Fee Code (\$)	Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description
1202	18	Claims in excess of 20
1201	86	Independent claims in excess of 3
1203	290	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid
1204	86	** Reissue independent claims over original patent
1205	18	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent

SUBTOTAL (2) (\$)

**or number previously paid, if greater. For Reissues, see above

Other fee (specify) _____

*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBTOTAL (3) (\$)

(Complete if applicable)

SUBMITTED BY			
Name (Print/Type)	<u>GIDEON POSTEL</u>	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	Telephone +972-2-541-7333
Signature	<u>Gideon Postel</u>	-	Date <u>03/22/04</u>

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Forward Collision Warning with a Single Camera

Erez Dagan Ofer Mano Gideon P. Stein Amnon Shashua
MobileEye Vision Technologies Ltd.
R.M.P.E building, Har-Hotzvim,
Jerusalem, 91450 Israel
erez.dagan,gideon.stein,ofer.mano,amnon.shashua@mobileye.com

Abstract

The large number of rear end collisions due to driver inattention has been identified as a major automotive safety issue. Even a short advance warning can significantly reduce the number and severity of the collisions. This paper describes a vision based Forward Collision Warning (FCW) system for highway safety. The algorithm described in this paper computes time to contact (TTC) and possible collision course directly from the size and position of the vehicles in the image - which are the natural measurements for a vision based system - without having to compute a 3D representation of the scene. The use of a single low cost image sensor results in an affordable system which is simple to install. The system has been implemented on real-time hardware and has been test driven on highways. Collision avoidance tests have also been performed on test tracks.

1 Introduction

One of the major challenges of the next generation of road transportation vehicles is to increase the safety of the passengers and of pedestrians. Over 10 million people are injured yearly worldwide in road accidents. These include two to three million severely injured and 400,000 fatalities. The financial damage of accidents is estimates as 1-3% of world GDP. Rear-end collisions constitute a significant proportion of the total accidents (29.5% in USA and 28% in Germany)[1].

Lack of attention by the driver is identified as the cause for 91% of driver related accidents. According to a 1992 study by Daimler-Benz (cited in [1]), if car drivers have a 0.5-second additional warning time, about 60% of rear-end collisions can be prevented. An extra second of warning time can prevent about 90% of rear-end collisions.

This places Forward Collision Warning (FCW) high on the list of solutions that can contribute significantly to reduction of the number and the severity of driving accidents. A range sensor mounted on the vehicle could provide a practical solution to this problem [3]. However, the prices of the traditional systems available today (typically based on Radar sensors) and their limited performance (narrow field of view and poor lateral resolution) have prevented such systems from entering the market. From a technological point of view, fusion of radar and vision is an attractive approach. In such a system




Figure 1: *The MobilEye-AWS.*

the radar gives accurate range and range-rate measurements while vision solves the angular accuracy problem of radar. However this solution is costly.

This paper presents MobilEye's vision based FCW system including experimental results. The algorithm described in this paper computes the Time-to-Contact (TTC) and possible collision course directly from the size and position of the vehicle in the image - which are the natural measurements for a vision based system - without having to compute a 3D representation of the scene. In particular, accurate range measurements are not required. Measurements from the host vehicle (speedometer, gas-pedal or brake-pedal position etc.) are not required but can be used in the complete system as a secondary filter to further anticipate the drivers intentions and reduce *unnecessary* alarms.

1.1 The MobilEye Advance Warning System (AWS)

Using a single forward facing camera located typically near the rear view mirror, the MobilEye-AWS detects and tracks vehicles on the road ahead providing range, relative speed and lane position data. The system detects also the lane markings and road edges and measures the distance of the host vehicle to road boundaries. Thus it combines together on the same platform Forward Collision Warning, Lane Departure Warning and Headway Monitoring. It can also be connected to active safety systems.

The camera used in this work has VGA sensor (640×480) and a horizontal FOV of 47° . A small display unit and a pair of left and right speakers (see Figure 1) inside the car provide audio and visual warnings, allowing the driver to react to various types of dangerous situations and to reduce the risk of accidents. The system warning thresholds are adaptable to different driving styles.

2 Momentary Time to Contact

One method for FCW analyzed in [4] uses *time to contact* (TTC) to trigger the warning. A Forward Collision Warning (FCW) is issued when the *time-to-contact* (TTC) is lower than a certain threshold - typically 2 seconds. We will define the momentary Time To Contact (T_m) as

$$T_m = -\frac{Z}{V} \quad (1)$$

where Z is the relative distance to the target and V the relative velocity.

Since distance and relative speed are not natural vision measures, we will show that we can represent the momentary TTC as a function of scale-change in the image in a given sampling interval (Δt). This value can be computed accurately from the image sequence as shown in [2].

The perspective projection model of the camera gives:

$$w_t = \frac{fW}{Z_t} \quad (2)$$

where w_t is the width of the target in the image at time t , Z_t is the distance to the target, W is the vehicle width, and f is the camera focal length.

We define scale-change S as the ratio between the width in the image in two consecutive frames

$$S = \frac{w_1}{w_0} = \frac{\frac{fW}{Z_1}}{\frac{fW}{Z_0}} = \frac{Z_0}{Z_1} \quad (3)$$

When the time interval between Z_1 and Z_0 is small we can write:

$$Z_1 = Z_0 + V\Delta t \quad (4)$$

Thus:

$$S = \frac{Z_1}{Z_1 - V\Delta t}. \quad (5)$$

Extracting $\frac{Z_1}{V}$ from the equation above yields:

$$T_m = \frac{Z_1}{V} = \frac{\Delta t}{S - 1}. \quad (6)$$

Equation 6 gives the momentary TTC solely on scale-change and time information.

3 Modeling Acceleration

The problem with the momentary TTC computation is that it neglects relative acceleration between the two vehicles. Relative acceleration will occur when the target vehicle performs a sudden stop or when the host vehicle is slowing down to avoid collision. Both cases are very important in an FCW application. Not detecting the host vehicle slowing down will give many false alarms (e.g. when

nearing a stop light). Using the brake signal may not be enough since many times the driver might slow down by simply taking his or her foot off from the gas pedal.

Taking into account relative acceleration, the relative distance between the two vehicle as a function of time is given by:

$$Z = Z_0 + V_0 \Delta t + \frac{1}{2} a \Delta t^2. \quad (7)$$

TTC (which we will denote simply as T) is the time that $Z = 0$ (as in [4]), thus:

$$T = \frac{-V_0 + \sqrt{V_0^2 - 2Z_0 a}}{a} \quad (8)$$

As mentioned above, the values distance, speed and acceleration are not natural vision measurements and we wish to use scale-change. In this section we show how to compute the actual TTC in a constant acceleration model based on T_m and its derivative \dot{T}_m , both of which can be computed from scale-change in the image.

The momentary TTC is given by:

$$T_m = -\frac{Z}{V}. \quad (9)$$

Thus its derivative is:

$$\dot{T}_m = \frac{-\dot{Z} \cdot V + \dot{V} \cdot Z}{V^2} \quad (10)$$

Since $\dot{Z} = V$ and $\dot{V} = a$ and we get:

$$\dot{T}_m = \frac{-V^2 + a \cdot Z}{V^2} = -1 + \frac{a \cdot Z}{V^2} = \frac{a \cdot Z}{V^2} - 1 \quad (11)$$

Let us define an assistance variable

$$C = \dot{T}_m + 1 = \frac{a \cdot Z}{V^2} \quad (12)$$

The T_m and its derivative are measures taken from the current image thus Z and V actually refers to Z_0 and V_0 , so we can say:

$$T_m = -\frac{Z_0}{V_0} \quad (13)$$

and

$$C = \frac{a \cdot Z_0}{V_0^2}. \quad (14)$$

Extracting a from (14) we get:

$$a = C \cdot \frac{V_0^2}{Z_0} \quad (15)$$

Now we'll show how to define T in the vision natural measures T_m and \dot{T}_m . Substituting (15) in (8) we get:

$$T = \frac{-V_0 + \sqrt{V_0^2 + 2C \cdot V_0^2}}{a} \quad (16)$$

$$= \frac{-V_0 + V_0 \cdot \sqrt{1 + 2C}}{a} \quad (17)$$

Substituting (15) in (17) results in:

$$T = \frac{-V_0 + V_0 \cdot \sqrt{1+2C}}{C \cdot \frac{V_0^2}{Z_0}} \quad (18)$$

$$= \frac{-1 + \sqrt{1+2C}}{C \cdot \frac{V_0}{Z_0}} \quad (19)$$

Substituting $-T_m$ for $\frac{Z_0}{V_0}$ (equation 13) we get:

$$T = \frac{-1 + \sqrt{1+2C}}{\frac{C}{-T_m}} \quad (20)$$

$$= -T_m \cdot \frac{-1 + \sqrt{1+2C}}{C} \quad (21)$$

$$= T_m \cdot \frac{1 - \sqrt{1+2C}}{C} \quad (22)$$

where C is a function of T_m as in (12).

4 Lateral Collision Decision

After computing the TTC and determining that we are rapidly closing the distance to the target the second half of the FCW system goal is to determine if we are in fact on a possible collision course. In highway driving it is possible to use lane markings. In urban scenes lane markings may not exist and drivers may drive in-between lanes therefore this cue is not reliable. Fortunately the position of the vehicle boundaries in the image and their optic flow provide the required information.

We will first show that it is possible to determine a collision course based on image measurements alone without knowing the distance to the target vehicle or the target vehicles physical width. We will then show how to integrate the range information if it is known.

Let $x_l(t)$ and $x_r(t)$ be the image coordinates of the left and right edges of the target vehicle at time t . Let $Z(0)$ be the distance at time $t = 0$ and we set $Z(0) = 1$ in some arbitrary units. Using the perspective projection equation we can compute the vehicle width in the same arbitrary units:

$$W = \frac{(x_r(0) - x_l(0))Z(0)}{f} \quad (23)$$

As we approach the followed vehicle we can compute the range $Z(t)$:

$$Z(t) = \frac{fW}{x_r(t) - x_l(t)} \quad (24)$$

$$= \frac{(x_r(0) - x_l(0))Z(0)}{x_r(t) - x_l(t)} \quad (25)$$




Figure 2: Results from balloon-car experiments. Lateral position of the outside edges of the target vehicle during a rapid approach plotted as a function of time (t). TTC is indicated by the tall vertical line and host vehicle position is marked by an X. (a) collision course. (b) one of the vehicles is performing an avoidance maneuver.

We can then use $Z(t)$ to compute the relative lateral position of the car:

$$X_l(t) = \frac{x_l(t)Z(t)}{f} \quad (26)$$

$$X_r(t) = \frac{x_r(t)Z(t)}{f} \quad (27)$$

Substituting (24) into the above we get:

$$X_l(t) = \frac{x_l(t)Z(0)}{f} \frac{x_r(0) - x_l(0)}{x_r(t) - x_l(t)} \quad (28)$$

$$X_r(t) = \frac{x_r(t)Z(0)}{f} \frac{x_r(0) - x_l(0)}{x_r(t) - x_l(t)} \quad (29)$$

Figure 2a shows the results of tracking the left and right edge points of the followed vehicle as a function of time. These lines are then extrapolated to time $t = TTC$. If $X_l(t)$ is still to the left and $X_r(t)$ still to the right then the target vehicle is on a collision course. If both $X_l(t)$ and $X_r(t)$ are to one side then the target vehicle is not on a collision course with the camera mounted in the host vehicle. This is shown in figure 2b. The experiments were performed on a test track with a balloon-car as the target vehicle. We use the last 9 measurements (0.9 sec at 10 HZ) and perform a linear fit. Since we only need to apply this procedure when the TTC is small ($T < 3\text{sec}$) the extrapolation error is not large.




Figure 3: *The remote mounting structure.*

Note that the lateral positions $X_l(t)$ and $X_r(t)$ are in our arbitrary units. If we have even a rough estimate of $Z(0)$ then we convert the lateral position to meters and create a safety margin around the host vehicle. A method for computing the range estimate is shown in [2]

5 Experiments and Results

5.1 Test Apparatus

In normal driving conditions FCW rarely occurs and only false alarms can be tested in this way. In order to test FCW reliability and accuracy specific tests were performed in a test area.

The tests had to simulate car crash, for this purpose a lightweight, rigid metal structure was built and was assembled on the top of the host vehicle (a Renault Kangoo), as shown in figure 3a. The camera was mounted at the edge of this structure (see figure 3b) extending out to the right of the vehicle. The host vehicle can then pass to the left of the target vehicle with the remotely mounted camera passing just over the target vehicle simulating a crash. The only difference is that the camera is about 20cm higher than it would be if mounted inside the host vehicle.

Figure 4 shows a crash simulation sequence. In order to know exactly the frame where the crash occurred, a horizontal white line ribbon was marked on rear window of the target vehicle so that when the camera is exactly above the rear bumper of the target vehicle the white ribbon is at the bottom of the image (see figure 4d).

5.2 Accuracy Tests

The first set of tests was TTC accuracy. An accuracy test was made by recording a collision sequence and then analyzing the TTC signal offline in the office. In this analysis the collision time is known and we can compare the predicted time to actual collision time.

There were two different scene dynamics measured: constant speed and relative acceleration:

1. Constant Relative Speed: the host vehicle drives toward a stationary target vehicle and past it at a constant speed.




Figure 4: The camera passing just over the top of the target vehicle as recorded during a collision simulation. In (d) the camera is exactly above the rear bumper.




Figure 5: Scenario 1: constant relative speed. A comparison between the actual TTC (X-axis) and estimated TTC (Y-axis) for all ten sequences.

2. Relative Acceleration: the host and lead vehicles drive at the same constant speed. The lead vehicle performs a sudden brake while the host vehicle continues in the same speed until passing the stopping (or stopped) lead vehicle.

Ten clips of each scenario were recorded. In figure 5 we see comparison between the real TTC and the estimated TTC for all ten clips of the constant speed experiments (scenario 1). We see that in general the estimated TTC is reasonably accurate below 2 seconds with the noise increasing when the TTC is larger.

In Figure 6 we see the results from one sequence from scenario 2: lead vehicle decelerating. We see that the momentary TTC is a curve while the TTC estimated using a constant acceleration model is correctly aligned aligned around the $y = -x$ line. In Figure 7 we see that this behavior is qualitatively the same for all the ten sequences.




Figure 6: A single example of scenario 2: lead vehicle is decelerating. Comparing momentary TTC (crosses) and the modified TTC (triangles) to the ground truth TTC.




Figure 7: Scenario 2: lead vehicle is decelerating. Comparing momentary TTC (crosses) and the modified TTC (triangles) to the ground truth TTC for all 10 clips.

In order to see quantitatively how the errors in TTC estimates depend on the actual TTC we binned the measurements into 1 second bins and computed the mean error and standard deviation for each bin separately. The results are shown in table 1. We see that for larger actual TTC the standard deviation of the estimated TTC increases. For TTC values below 2 seconds the TTC is quite accurate even in the presence of relative acceleration. Future work involves improving the tracking accuracy (namely scale measurement) to allow for reliable warnings at TTC of 3 seconds and up.

5.3 Warning Tests

In addition to measuring the signal quality, a series of tests was performed to test the effectiveness of the system. There were three types of scenarios: sudden brake avoidance, slow avoidance (slowly stopping behind a parking vehicle) and lateral avoidance.

TTC (sec)	Constant Speed		Acceleration	
	mean	std	mean	std
0-1	0.01	0.046	0.002	0.039
1-2	-0.05	0.022	-0.042	0.26
2-3	-0.07	0.54	-0.37	1.22
3-4	0.087	0.76	-0.7	2.83
4-5	-0.52	1.03	N/A	N/A

Table 1: Errors in TTC estimates for the two tests scenarios: constant speed and relative acceleration. Results were binned according to the actual TTC and then the mean and standard deviation was computed for each bin.

5.3.1 Sudden Brake Avoidance

In this test we want to examine the relevance of the two second warning when the target (or lead) vehicle brakes suddenly. During these tests the two vehicles are traveling at 40KPH and the lead vehicle suddenly brakes. The driver of the host vehicle waits for the 2 second warning from the system and then performs an emergency braking. After both vehicles come to a complete stop we measured the relative position of the lead vehicle and the camera.

In the first set of ten tests the lead vehicle did a slow stopping (i.e. light braking so that it took approximately 4 seconds to reach a complete stop or approximately $0.3m/s^2$). In this test set the average distant after both vehicles were stopped was 2m and the minimum distance 1m.

In the second set of tests the lead vehicle performed an emergency stop and came to a complete standstill in under 1 second. In this set the average distance after both vehicles were stopped was 30cm and three out of ten sequences the camera passed the rear bumper of the lead car but by no more than 20cm. This means a collision at low speed as opposed to the 40kph collision without the system - a fender bender rather than serious injury.

5.3.2 Slow Avoidance

This test measured the false alarm rate when approaching a parked vehicle with the host vehicle driver aware and alert. This is a typical scenario when approaching a traffic light and the system must not produce a false signals in this case. The host vehicle is driving toward a stationary vehicle and slowly decelerate and fully stops behind the followed vehicle. In two out of the ten sequences a short false alarm was given each for two frames only (0.2 seconds). At the system level these false alarms can be eliminated using the host vehicles speedometer readings since the host vehicle is decelerating.

5.3.3 Lateral Avoidance

The host vehicle approaches the lead vehicle at a constant speed and when TTC is three seconds the host vehicle driver switches to the next lane to avoid crash. This is the typical situation of the host vehicle doing a very tight passing maneuver. This test was done with normal mounted camera inside the car and not with the test mount. In none of the ten tests a false warning was given.

6 Summary and Future Work

We have presented an FCW system which uses a single camera as input. Image scale change and image position are used directly for computing TTC and whether the target vehicle is on a collision path thus avoiding the need to compute distances and velocity. The system was tested on real-time hardware and the warning signal was shown to be useful in avoiding accidents or mitigating the consequences. Further improvements to the vehicle tracking are required to extend the warnings range to 3 seconds if desired.

References

- [1] National Transportation Safety Board, Special Investigation Report - Highway Vehicle- and Infrastructure-based Technology For the Prevention of Rear-end Collisions. NTSB Number SIR-01/01, May 2001
- [2] G. P. Stein, O. Mano and A. Shashua, Vision-based ACC with a Single Camera: Bounds on Range and Range Rate Accuracy In *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV2003)*, June 2003, Columbus, OH.
- [3] G. R. Widman, W. A. Bauson and S. W. Allard Development of collision avoidance systems at Delphi Automotive Systems, In *Proceedings of the Int. Conf. Intelligent Vehicles*, pages 353 -358, 1998
- [4] L. Yang, J.H. Yang, E. Feron and V. Kulkarni development of a Performance-Based Approach for Rear-End Collision Warning and Avoidance System for Automobiles In *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV2003)*, June 2003, Columbus, OH.
- [5] P. Zador, S. Krawchuck and R. Voas Automotive Collision Avoidance System (ACAS) Program/First Annual Report. NHTSA, DOT HS 809 080, August 2000